

Appln No. 10/760,263  
Amdt. Dated February 1, 2007  
Response to Office Action of November 24, 2006

4

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 31 2007

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to Office Action dated November 24, 2006, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

#### Specification

The paragraph entitled "Cross-Reference to Co-pending Applications" at pages 1 and 2 of the specification has been deleted and replaced by a new paragraph, merely to update US applications numbers with their corresponding US granted patent numbers. The applicant submits that this amendment introduces no new matter.

#### Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly define that components making up the cartridge are removed when the cartridge is removed.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add new matter.

#### Claims – 35USC§102

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-3 for lack of novelty in light of US 6,347,864 to Silverbrook. Claim 1 has been amended to clearly distinguish it from the cited reference.

Claim 1 has been amended to explicitly define that the cartridge has a cartridge body configured for insertion into, and removal from, a printer. The '864 does not have a removable cartridge with inbuilt pagewidth printhead. The print roll cartridge 504 does not include the pagewidth printhead assembly 508. The printhead assembly 508 is permanently retained within the small electronic device. Only the print roll cartridge is removed and replaced.

The Examiner argues that "[t]he cartridge of Silverbrook comprises the removable cartridge body (504) and the printhead (516), and is a portion of the print engine (500)". This is plainly incorrect. The only cartridge disclosed in cited reference is the print roll cartridge (504). The cartridge (504) does not comprise a printhead. The printhead sub-assembly (508) has a printhead (516). The printhead sub-assembly (508) is not a component of the print roll cartridge (504).

Appin No. 10760,263  
Amdt. Dated February 1, 2007  
Response to Office Action of November 24, 2006

5

It is well established that a cited reference must teach all the claim elements in order to support a §102 rejection. The '864 reference does not teach a cartridge that has a printhead and therefore fails to anticipate claim 1. It follows that the dependent claims are likewise novel.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been successfully traversed. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762